

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 20, 21, 23-26, and 28-32. Moreover, Applicants thank the Examiner for noting that claims 2-6, 9, 11 and 13-19 contain allowable subject matter if rewritten in independent form. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 12. Applicants respectfully traverse and have placed the application in allowable form in response to the fact that the Office Action has been made final.

Claim 1 has been rewritten to include the subject matter of claim 9 and claim 9 has been cancelled. The Examiner has indicated that claim 9 contains allowable subject matter. Claim 1 has been rewritten into independent form including the features of claim 9. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is now in a condition for allowance as rewritten.

Claims 7, 8, and 10 all depend from independent claim 1 as rewritten and therefore include all of the limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 7, 8, 10 are allowable over the references of record for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 as rewritten.

Similarly, claim 12 contains the limitation of “an opening formed through the shroud wire end and allowing said at least one wire to pass therethrough.” This exact subject matter is contained in cancelled claim 9 that the Examiner has indicated as allowable subject matter. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 contains allowable subject matter as indicated by the Examiner and therefore is in condition for allowance.

The applicants also note that the combination of the Davis et al reference and the Korsunsky et al reference by the Office Action is improper. There is no suggestion in the

Davis et al reference to overmold around the wire. In fact, the Davis reference teaches away from overmolding around the wire because it teaches to insert the wire after the overmolding process has been finished. Therefore, the combination of these references was improper because the Davis reference teaches away from the overmolding taught in Korsunsky. This argument is being made to preserve a record. The argument is unneeded to allow the case. The amendment to claim 1 and the allowable subject matter in claim 12 places all claims in condition for allowance even over the improper combination of references by the Office Action.

Accordingly, all pending claims are in condition for allowance and the applicants respectfully request they pass to issue. Should it facilitate the allowance of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

No additional fees are believed to be necessary, however, should any fees be deemed required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 23-3030, but is not to include payment of issue fees.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Troy J. Cole
Reg. No. 35,102
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty,
McNett & Henry LLP
Bank One Center/Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
(317) 634-3456

AMENDMENT TO OFFICE ACTION
Page 15 of 15

Serial No. 10/017,827
Group Art Unit 2833